



GOVERNMENT OF INDIA

# Chandigarh Administration Gazette

Published by Authority

---

NO. 123] CHANDIGARH, MONDAY, SEPTEMBER 02, 2024 ( BHADRA 11, 1946 SAKA)

---

CHANDIGARH ADMINISTRATION  
TRANSPORT DEPARTMENT

## Notification

The 29th August, 2024

**No. 4/1/2/90-H-III-(7)-2024/13514.**—In partial modification of Chandigarh Administration, Transport Department, Notification bearing No. 4/1/2/90-H-III-(7)-99/20132, dated 13.10.99 and Notification bearing No. 4/1/2/90-HIII(7)-2014/15701, dated 20.08.2014 regarding reconstituting the State Transport Authority, U.T., Chandigarh, Smt. Kirron Kher, Ex. Member of Parliament (Lok Sabha), U.T., Chandigarh is allowed to continue as Non - Official member of the State Transport Authority, U.T., Chandigarh.

Chandigarh :  
The, 09.07.2024.

VINAY PRATAP SINGH, IAS,  
Secretary Transport,  
Chandigarh Administration.

Signature Not Verified

Digitally signed by  
Jalinder Kumar  
Date: 2024.09.02  
02:43:46 IST  
Reason: Published  
Location:

(2007)

*This is Digitally Signed Gazette. To verify, visit :  
<https://egazette.chd.gov.in>*

CHANDIGARH ADMINISTRATION  
LABOUR DEPARTMENT

**Notification**

The 28th August, 2024

**No. 13/2/144-HII(2)-2024/13429.**—In exercise of the Powers conferred by sub-section (i) of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Central Act No. 14 of 1947) read with Government of India, Ministry of Labour & Employment's Notification No. S-11025/21/2003-IR(PL) dated 28.7.2004, the undersigned hereby publish the following award bearing reference No. **81/2020** dated **29.05.2024** delivered by the Presiding Officer, Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court, UT Chandigarh between :

MOHD. KHALIL, H.NO.72, HALLOMAJRA, U.T. CHANDIGARH. (Workman)

AND

M/S FRIENDS INDUSTRIES, PLOT NO.435, PHASE - II, RAM DARBAR, INDUSTRIAL AREA, CHANDIGARH THROUGH ITS MANAGER. (Management)

**AWARD**

1. Mohd. Khalil, workman has presented industrial dispute under Section 2A(2) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (*here-in-after in short called 'ID Act'*).

2. Briefly stated the averments of claim statement are that the claimant-workman (*here-in-after 'workman'*) was appointed by the respondent-management (*here-in-after 'management'*) in the year 1994 as Operator on Shearing Machine. He was made member of the ESI scheme in the year 1998 when he met with an accident during & in the course of employment. Workman was allotted ESI No.1708275158. The workman remained in the continuous and uninterrupted employment up to 11.06.2020 when his services were illegally & wrongfully terminated by refusing of work. The workman was drawing ₹19,100/- per month as wages. On 12.06.2020 at about 4:00 P.M. workman received a call from the Police Beat Box, Industrial Area, Phase - II, Chandigarh. The workman went there and found two gents and one lady Constable there in the beat box. The Manager of the management (management impleaded through it's Manager) along with son of the owner of the factory Mr. Nitin Sikka and Mr. Brij Kishore Sikka himself were also present there. Mr. Brij Kishore Sikka and Police Constable started putting pressure on the workman for a settlement. The entire persons present there started harassing the workman and threatened him that if the workman will not make any compromise with the management, they will involve the workman in a false case. The workman was so terrified and left with no alternative but to accept the terms of the management. The management got his signatures on blank papers and gave a sum of ₹ 25,000/- only to the workman towards the unpaid wages for the full month of May and 11 days of June, 2020. The alleged settlement and the amount received was not volunteer but due to forced circumstances. The workman immediately sent a letter to the management and made a complaint with the Senior Superintendent of Police (SSP), U.T. Chandigarh in this regard. On 13.06.2020 as per the verbal terms of settlement, the workman went to attend his normal duties but he was refused work by the management without assigning any reason and notice. Refusal of work, which amounts to termination, is retrenchment under Section 2(oo) of the ID Act. The management has also violated Section 25F of the ID Act. No charge sheet was issued, no inquiry was held and the workman was not paid retrenchment compensation at the time of termination. Violation of the same makes the termination void. For his reinstatement, the workman served upon the management demand notice dated 13.06.2020. The management neither denied the contents of the demand notice nor took the workman back on duty. The Assistant Labour Commissioner-cum-Conciliation Officer, U.T. Chandigarh was requested for intervention into the matter. The Conciliation Officer intervened but the management refused to take the workman back on duty. The management did not appear before the Conciliation Officer on the last date of hearing. The termination is illegal, wrongful, motivated, against the

principles of natural justice and unfair labour practice. The workman remained unemployed during the period i.e. from the date of termination to till date. Prayer is made that the workman may be reinstated with continuity of service along with full back wages and without any change in his service conditions and with full attendant benefits.

3. On notice, management contested the claim statement by filing written statement dated 18.04.2022 filed on 19.04.2022, wherein preliminary submissions / objections are raised to the effect that answering respondent (*here-in-after 'management'*) did not terminate the services of the claimant (*here-in-after 'workman'*) at any point of time. It was the workman who left the job at his own wisdom and will. The matter of fact is that the workman misbehaved with the co-worker as well as the Administrative Officers on various occasions and disturbed the smooth functioning of the management establishment. Some time his behaviour becomes such furious that he threatened the administrative staff with dire consequences, if they did not toe his line or deduct his advance from the salary. On 11.06.2020 when the Accountant of the management was disbursing salaries to the workman working in the establishment, the workman misbehaved and threatened Manager-cum-Accountant Mr. Davinder Sharma and also threatened him that he will see him and left the premises at once and did not turn up. Thereafter, when he came on 13.06.2020 in the morning the management asked him to feel sorry to the Manager for his misconduct but instead of apologize he extended threat to the life of Manager Mr. Davinder Sharma. Under the compelling circumstances, the Proprietor of the establishment namely Brij Kumar Sikka made a complaint on 13.06.2020 to the police so that any unforeseen incident or accident may be prevented. On the information police called the management and workman, where workman shown his intention not to continue with the work and asked the management to settle his account. Therefore, upon checking the account, total amount due was ₹ 7,640/- on account of his work and ₹ 9,550/- on account of his bonus. However, on the demand of the workman, sum of ₹ 25,000/- was given to him as full & final payment and settlement to this effect was also recorded which was duly acknowledge and accepted by the workman as well as the management. Complaint is of dated 13.06.2020, statement is of dated 13.06.2020 and DDR is of dated 04.06.2020. It is further submitted that it is well established by now that if the workman intend to quit the job from any establishment on his own volition, then he cannot claim reinstatement after receiving the full & final amount as accepted and agreed. Further, the malafide of the workman may also be gathered from the fact that on 13.06.2020 the establishment made a complaint against the workman then he extended threats to the life of Mr. Davinder Sharma and settled the matter by receiving full & final payment and on the very same day workman very conveniently made demand notice dated 13.06.2020 itself. The workman has not completed 240 days in the preceding one year from the date he left the job on his own. Therefore, the instant claim of the workman deserves to be dismissed on this ground alone. In view of the facts, situation and circumstances explained above, the present claim statement deserves to be dismissed with cost.

4. Further in para-wise reply, it is submitted that the workman worked with the management establishment since long but never worked continuously and there was no fixed salary as he was working on daily wage basis. Further his services were never terminated by the management establishment. Rather he left of his own. Further similar stand is taken as taken in the preliminary submissions / objections. It is further submitted that the reply to the demand notice has been submitted before the Learned Assistant Labour Commissioner on 29.06.2020. Rest of the averments of claim statement are denied being wrong and incorrect. Prayer is made that the claim of the workman may be dismissed in the interest of justice.

5. The workman filed rejoinder, wherein all the contents of the written statement, except admitted facts, are denied as wrong and averments of claim statement are reiterated.

6. From the pleadings of the parties, following issues were framed vide order dated 13.09.2022 :-

1. Whether the termination is illegal, null and void ? OPW
2. If issue No.1 is proved in affirmative, whether the workman is entitled to reinstatement with continuity of service, full back wages and all consequential benefits, as prayed for ? OPW
3. Whether the claim statement is not maintainable ? OPM
4. Relief.

7. In evidence, workman Mohd. Khalil examined himself as AW1 and tendered his affidavit Exhibit 'AW1/1'. On 28.07.2023 the workman closed his evidence in affirmative.

8. On the other hand, management examined MW1 Brij Mohan Sikka, who tendered into evidence his affidavit Exhibit 'MW1/A' along with copies of documents Mark 'A' to Mark 'C'. In cross-examination of MW1 brought on record statement Mark 'D'.

**Mark 'A'** is photocopy of complaint dated 13.06.2020 filed by Proprietor for Friends Industries to SHO, Police Station, Sector 31, Chandigarh against Mohd. Khalil.

**Mark 'B' & Mark 'D'** are same documents i.e. is photocopy of statement dated Nil of Brij Kumar Sharma S/o Late Hari Chand Sikkha R/o 2802, Sector 38-C, Chandigarh allegedly recorded by the police in inquiry proceedings of complaint dated 13.06.2020.

**Mark 'C'** is photocopy of DDR / General Diary Details bearing GD No.002 dated 14.06.2020, Police Station, Sector 31, Chandigarh, lodged on the written complaint of Brij Kumar.

9. The management examined ASI Shiv Kumar, No.3112/CHD, Police Station, Sector 31, Chandigarh as MW2, who brought the summoned record Exhibit 'MW2/1' to Exhibit 'MW2/3'.

**Exhibit 'MW2/1'** is the attested copy of DDR / General Diary Details bearing GD No.002 dated 14.06.2020, Police Station, Sector 31, Chandigarh, lodged on the written complaint of Brij Kumar.

**Exhibit 'MW2/2'** is the attested copy of complaint dated 13.06.2020 filed by Proprietor for Friends Industries to SHO, Police Station, Sector 31, Chandigarh against Mohd. Khalil.

**Exhibit 'MW2/3'** is the attested copy of statement dated Nil of Brij Kumar Sharma S/o Late Hari Chand Sikkha R/o 2802, Sector 38-C, Chandigarh allegedly recorded by the police in inquiry proceedings of complaint dated 13.06.2020.

10. On 03.05.2024 Learned Representative for the management closed oral evidence and on 29.05.2024 closed documentary evidence of the management.

11. I have heard the arguments of Learned Representatives for the parties and have perused the judicial file. My issue-wise findings are as below :-

**Issues No. 1 & 2 :**

12. Both these issues are taken up together being interconnected and in order to avoid repetition of discussion.

13. Onus to prove both these issues is on the workman.

14. Under these issues, the workman examined himself as AW1 and vide his affidavit Exhibit 'AW1/A' deposed the averments of the claim statement in toto, which are not reproduced here for the sake of brevity.

15. In order to rebut the testimony of the workman, the management examined MW1 Brij Kumar Sikka - Authorised Signatory, M/s Friends Industries, who vide his affidavit Exhibit 'MW1/A' deposed that Mohd. Khalil was working with M/s Friends Industries and there is no fixed salary and payments were being made on the monthly basis by calculating the working days only. Mohd. Khalil was having quarrelsome behaviour. On 11.06.2020 he misbehaved with Mr. Davinder Sharma and also threatened him and left the premises but he did not turn up and on 13.06.2020 he came and instead of admitting his mistake, he extended threat of life to Mr. Davinder Sharma. Under such circumstances, complaint was made on 13.06.2020. On the compliant Mohd. Khalil was called by the police whereby he straightway said that he does not want to



continue with the work and asked to clear his dues. Accordingly, his accounts were checked and he was paid ₹ 25,000/- as full & final payment and statement was also recorded which are already on record. Mohd. Khalil has abandoned the job on his own and there was no termination by the management, therefore, he is not entitled to any relief.

16. For corroboration, the management examined MW2 ASI Shiv Kumar, Police Station, Sector 31, Chandigarh who deposed that he has brought the summoned record i.e. copy of DDR No.2 dated 14.06.2020, Police Station, Sector 31, Chandigarh Exhibit 'MW2/1'; copy of complaint dated 13.06.2020 made by Brij Kumar Sikka - Proprietor of M/s Friends Industries vide Exhibit 'MW2/2' and copy of statement of settlement between Mohd. Khalil, Davinder Sharma and Brij Kumar Sikka vide Exhibit 'MW2/3'.

17. From the oral as well as documentary evidence led by the parties, it come out that undisputedly the workman was employed with M/s Friends Industries. The workman in his statement of claim and affidavit Exhibit 'AW1/A' alleged that he was appointed by the management in the year 1994. MW1 in his cross-examination admitted the suggestion as correct that the workman is working with the management since year 1995. From the aforesaid suggestion put by the workman to MW1, which is admitted as correct by MW1, it comes out that it is own plea of the workman that he was working with the management since year 1995. The plea taken by the workman in the claim statement and in his affidavit Exhibit 'AW1/A' that he remains in the continuous and un-interrupted employment of the management up to 11.06.2020 is disputed by the management. In para 1 of the written statement in para-wise reply, the management has taken the plea that the workman worked with the management establishment since long but never worked continuously and there was no fixed salary as he was working on daily wage basis. The aforesaid plea taken by the management in the written statement does not stand proved because MW1 when put to cross-examination stated that he has not brought any record to prove that the workman was not in the continuous employment. MW1 admitted as correct that the workman was getting salary of ₹ 19,100/- per month. The plea taken by the workman that he was covered by the management under the ESI scheme in the year 1998 is denied as wrong and incorrect in the written statement. The denial of the fact by the management that workman was covered under the ESI scheme stands disproved from cross-examination of MW1 wherein he has stated that the management is registered under the ESI scheme and the workman was also covered under the ESI scheme. The management has alleged that all dues of the workman were paid in the Police Station, Sector 31, Chandigarh in the matter of police inquiry of complaint dated 13.06.2020 / Exhibit 'MW2/2' moved by Brij Kumar Sikka (MW1) against the workman. The contents of Exhibit 'MW2/2' would support the plea of the workman that he worked continuously with the management up to 11.06.2020. For better appreciation the contents of Exhibit 'MW2/2' are reproduced as below :-

*"I would like to inform you that I running workshop at the above mentioned address. One of my worker Mohd. Khalil is working with me for the last many years. But for the last 8-10 years, he has been become very aggressive. He fight with every body in my workshop. This time he fight with my Manager-cum-Accountant Mr. Davinder Sharma at the time of disbursement of wages on 11.06.2020 for the m/o May 2020. He argu for deduction of advance and threat him I will see to you. Next day 12.06.2020 he was absent. Today morning he came, I request him to speak sorry to Manager, to refused and speak (written in Hindi language) Ke Main Choduganahi, pehlebbhi kai bar larrchukahai.*

*So I am requested please look into the matter and advise him not to fight with anybody. His name is Mohd. Khalil S/o Raj Mohd., 70, Hallomajra, Ram Darbar Chandigarh."*

18. The cross-examination of MW1 referred above and the contents of the complaint dated 13.06.2020, Exhibit 'MW2/2' would prove that the workman remained in continuous employment of the management from year 1995 up to 11.06.2020. In this manner, the workman has completed continuous service

of 240 days in 12 calendar months preceding termination. Thus, the workman fulfils the requirement of Section 25B of the ID Act. Once the workman falls within the purview of Section 25B of the ID Act, the provision of Section 25F of the ID Act is attracted. Learned Representative for the management contended that on 11.06.2020 the workman quarreled with Mr. Davinder Sharma - Manager-cum-Accountant of the management and left from there after threatening Mr. Davinder Sharma with dire consequences. On next day 12.06.2020 the workman did not turn up. On 13.06.2020 workman came to the work place of management. Proprietor Brij Kumar Sikka told the workman to feel sorry to Mr. Davinder Sharma, to which the workman refused. Then, Proprietor Brij Kumar Sikka moved written complaint to SHO, PS Sector 31, Chandigarh on the basis of which DDR No.002 dated 14.06.2020 / Exhibit 'MW2/1' was lodged. The police inquiry was conducted, in which the Proprietor Brij Kumar Sikka, Manager-cum-Accountant Mr. Davinder Sharma and workman Mohd. Khalil were called by the police inquiry officer. During inquiry proceedings the matter was compromised which was reduced into writing Exhibit 'MW2/3' and compromise amount of ₹ 25,000/- was paid to the workman towards full & final settlement by Proprietor Brij Kumar Sikka. Learned Representative for the management further contended that the workman after receipt of ₹ 25,000/- towards full & final settlement has left with no claim of any kind from the management. Moreover, workman has left the job of his own. Thus, there is no question of termination of services of the workman by the management. On the other hand, it is contended by Learned Representative for the workman that the alleged compromise is got effected by the Proprietor Brij Mohan Sikka in the Police Station, Sector 31, Chandigarh under pressure of police. Before effecting alleged compromise, the police intimidated the workman. To support his contention Learned Representative for workman referred cross-examination of workman / AW1 wherein he has stated that he was taken into custody by the police in the complaint lodged by Proprietor of the management. AW1 further stated that there the police official intimidated him. AW1 further stated that thereafter the settlement arrived to the effect that owner of the management will make payment of final dues to him. The above said facts pleaded by AW1 in his cross-examination are not controverted by the management by way of any suggestion. Learned Representative for the workman further contended that first of all the alleged compromise effected in the police station under the threat of police is invalid as the same is not executed voluntarily by the workman. Moreover, if for the sake of arguments it is assumed that a sum of ₹ 25,000/- was paid to the workman towards full & final settlement, even in that situation the amount of ₹ 25,000/- does not fall within the parameters of retrenchment compensation. The workman has admittedly rendered service for continuous period of about 26 years and last drawn wages of the workman were admittedly ₹ 19,200/-. Under Section 25F(b) of the ID Act, the retrenchment compensation shall be equivalent to 15 days average pay (for every completed year of continuous service) or any part thereof in excess of six months. By virtue of aforesaid provisions of law, keeping in view the length of service of the workman and his last paid monthly wages, the retrenchment compensation of the workman would be ₹ 2,49,600/-. Apart from that workman is also entitled to notice pay in lieu of one month's notice. Thus, the payment ₹ 25,000/- in no manner justified the conditions imposed in Section 25F of the ID Act. It is further contended by Learned Representative for the workman that the workman neither tendered written resignation nor orally resigned from the service. Learned Representative for the workman referred cross-examination of workman / AW1 wherein he has admitted as correct that he had quarrel with Davinder Sharma on 11.06.2020. AW1 further stated that thereafter he did not leave the job. It is further contended by Learned Representative for the workman that the payment of ₹ 25,000/- without disclosing the basis of calculation and that too under the compromise effected in the police station under the pressure of police and subsequent termination of services of the workman on the pretext of full & final payment is illegal and unfair labour practice.

19. To my opinion, the above said contentions raised by Learned Representative for the workman carries force for the reasons that the alleged compromise of ₹ 25,000/- towards full & final settlement cannot be said free from any kind of pressure because the same was executed in the police station and the management did not examine the police inquiry officer. MW2 ASI Shiv Kumar No.3112/CHD is admittedly not the Inquiry Officer of complaint dated 13.06.2020 Exhibit 'MW2/2' and MW2 is also not signatory to any of the documents or the alleged compromise effected between the parties in the police station. MW2 when put to cross-examination stated that he has not conducted police inquiry in the alleged complaint Exhibit 'MW2/2'. MW2

further stated that he does not know who was the complainant of complaint Exhibit 'MW2/2'. MW2 further stated that none of the documents exhibited in his examination-in-chief bears his signatures. Further more, the alleged compromise Exhibit 'MW2/3' is the statement of complainant Brij Kumar Sikka and it is not the joint statement of the complainant and the workman. As per the contents of statement Exhibit 'MW2/3' Proprietor Brij Kumar Sikka not only admitted the length of 26 years of continuous service of the workman but also stated that he is not ready to keep the workman any more in his employment. The contents of statement of Brij Kumar Sikka, Exhibit 'MW2/3' translated from Hindi language to English language are as below:-

*"Stated that I am residing along with my family at the aforesaid address and runs private business at plot No.435, Industrial Area, Phase - II, Chandigarh from last 26 years. Davinder Sharma is employed as Manager with him and Mohd. Khalil S/o Raj Mohd. R/o 72, Village Hallomajra, Chandigarh is also working with him from 26 years. On that day, on some matter dispute arose between them with Manager Davinder. We have mutually paid to Mohd. Rs.7,640/- up to this month and bonus Rs. 9,550/- which in total comes to Rs. 25,000/-. Now neither any amount is payable towards Mohd. nor he will keep him on job as we have mutually settled the matter."*

20. As per the aforesaid statement Exhibit 'MW2/3', the total sum of ₹ 7,640/- and ₹ 9,550/- comes to ₹ 17,190/-. In the said statement, it is not explained as to how the amount of ₹ 25,000/- is calculated. MW1 in his cross-examination stated that apart from ₹ 9,000/-, ₹ 10,000/- were paid to the workman and he got recorded his statement Mark 'D' to the police. If aforesaid version of MW1 is taken as correct, in that situation the total amount paid to the workman comes to ₹ 19,000/-. Thus, the contents of statement Exhibit 'MW2/3' / Mark 'D' and oral version of MW1 in his cross-examination are contradictory and thus, both are not trust worthy. However, the fact remains that the workman / AW1 in his cross-examination admitted the receipt of ₹ 25,000/- in cash from the Proprietor of the management. There is reason to disbelieve the workman's plea taken in his claim statement that the amount of ₹ 25,000/- was paid towards one month's wages of May and 11 days of June, 2020 as the management did not brought into evidence the wage register or the payment voucher to show that the salary of said period was already paid. Even if the workman has admitted the receipt of ₹ 25,000/- then also this amount is in sufficient to meet the requirement of Section 25F of the ID Act, which reads as below :-

***"25F. Conditions precedent to retrenchment of workmen. - No workman employed in any industry who has been in continuous service for not less than one year under an employer shall be retrenched by that employer until-***

- (a) the workman has been given one month's notice in writing indicating the reasons for retrenchment and the period of notice has expired, or the workman has been paid in lieu of such notice, wages for the period of the notice;*
- (b) the workman has been paid, at the time of retrenchment, compensation which shall be equivalent to fifteen days' average pay [for every completed year of continuous service] or any part thereof in excess of six months; and*
- (c) notice in the prescribed manner is served on the appropriate Government [or such authority as may be specified by the appropriate Government by notification in the Official Gazette]."*

21. In the present case, if the workman had quarreled with the Manager-cum-Accountant of the management, at the most it amounts to misconduct on the part of the workman for which the management must initiate disciplinary proceedings against him by way of issuing show cause notice, charge sheet etc. But the same has not been done. Before refusal of work, the management neither issued prior notice nor offered or

paid notice pay in lieu of the notice period nor paid retrenchment compensation as required under Section 25F of the ID Act, which makes termination of services of the workman illegal. The relations between the workman and the employer-management have become strained therefore the workman is held entitled to lump sum compensations of ₹ 3,00,000/-.

22. Accordingly, both these issues are decided in favour of the workman and against the management.

**Issue No. 3 :**

23. Onus to prove this issue is on the management.\

24. On being aggrieved from the act of the management, which terminated the services of the workman verbally by refusal of work on 11.06.2020, without compliance of conditions laid down under Section 25F of the ID Act, the workman raised industrial dispute by issuing demand notice, conciliation proceedings before the Assistant Labour Commissioner-cum-Conciliation Officer, U.T. Chandigarh failed vide Memo No.3693 dated 05.10.2020, upon which the workman was left with no other option then to approach this Court under Section 2A(2) of the ID Act. Thus, the workman has a valid cause of action and locus standi. The management industry situates within the territorial limits of U.T. Chandigarh where the workman was employed. Thus, this Court is well within its territorial jurisdiction to try and decide the present industrial dispute reference. I do not find any defect so far maintainability of the present industrial dispute reference is concerned.

25. Accordingly, this issue is decided against the management and in favour of the workman.

**Relief :**

26. In the view of foregoing finding on the issues above, the present industrial dispute is allowed to the effect that the workman is held entitled to lump sum compensation of ₹ 3,00,000/-. The management is directed to comply with the award within three months from the date of publication of the same in Government Gazette failing which the management is liable to pay interest at the rate 8% per annum on the above said amount from the date of this award till its realisation. Appropriate Government be informed. Copy of this award be also sent to Learned District Judge, Chandigarh in view of Sub-section 10 of Section 11 of the Industrial Disputes (Amendment) Act, 2010 for onward transmission of the same to concerned Civil Court. File be consigned to the record room.

(Sd.) . . . ,

Dated : 29.05.2024.

(JAGDEEP KAUR VIRK)  
PRESIDING OFFICER,  
Industrial Tribunal & Labour Court,  
Union Territory, Chandigarh.  
UID No. PB0152.



CHANDIGARH ADMINISTRATION  
LABOUR DEPARTMENT**Notification**

The 28th August, 2024

**No. 13/2/140-HII(2)-2024/13425.**—In exercise of the Powers conferred by sub-section (i) of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Central Act No. 14 of 1947) read with Government of India, Ministry of Labour & Employment's Notification No. S-11025/21/2003-IR(PL) dated 28.7.2004, the undersigned hereby publish the following award bearing reference No. **68/2023** dated **03.06.2024** delivered by the Presiding Officer, Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court, UT Chandigarh between :

SANJEEV SHARMA S/O MOHAN LAL SHARMA, R/O H.NO.222, SECTOR 52, CHANDIGARH.  
(Workman)

AND

1. M/S PUNJ FOOD FACILITY MANAGEMENT SERVICE, #3531, SECOND FLOOR, SECTOR 35-D, CHANDIGARH.  
(OLD NAME & ADDRESS:- PUNJ SECURITY, H.NO.454, NEAR DRONACHARYA STADIUM, VILLAGE DADU MAJRA, UT CHANDIGARH)
2. SHRI DIMPLE - THE PROPRIETOR / AUTHORIZED REPRESENTATIVE, M/S PUNJ FOOD FACILITY MANAGEMENT SERVICE, #3531, SECTOR 35, CHANDIGARH. (OLD NAME & ADDRESS:- PUNJ SECURITY, H.NO.454, NEAR DRONACHARYA STADIUM, VILLAGE DADU MAJRA, U.T. CHANDIGARH. (Management)

**AWARD**

1. Sanjeev Sharma, workman has presented industrial dispute under Section 2A(2) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (*here-in-after in short called 'ID Act'*).

2. Briefly stated the averments of claim statement are that the applicant (*here-in-after 'workman'*) is a law abiding citizen and is residing at H. No.222, Sector 52, Chandigarh. M/s Punj Security, operating from H. No. 454, Near Dronacharya Stadium, Village Dadu Majra, UT Chandigarh, was run by the respondent (*here-in-after 'management'*) No. 2 during the period 2006 to 2010. Under M/s Punj Security business, manpower (labor and security staff) was being provided to M/s Verka Milk Plant, Mohali and the workman worked as Helper at M/S Verka Milk Plant, Mohali through M/s Punj Security, from the year 2006 to 2010. The Provident fund of the workman was used to be deducted by the management No. 2 but due to the mental problems, due to an accident, suffered by the workman for long time, the amount of Provident Fund at that time could not be withdrawn. Now the management No.2 has changed the name of his company from "M/s Punj Security" to "M/s Punj Food Facility Management Service" and shifted to #3531 Second Floor, Sector 35 Chandigarh. The workman currently being little better after taking regular treatment, visited the office of the management No. 2, many times in the years 2021-2022, to enquire about the Provident Fund Account Number so that he could withdraw the amount from the office of Provident Fund but in vain. In order to get the PF Account number of the workman, the management No. 2 was issued demand notice under Section 2A of ID Act through Assistant Labour Commissioner. But no settlement could take place due to the evasive reply filed to the demand notice before the Assistant Labour Commissioner. The conciliation proceedings were closed on 26.05.2023 and the workman was advised to proceed further. Due to non-supply of the Provident Fund account number by the managements, the workman could not withdraw his provident fund resulting in not only financial loss but also suffered mental set back. No such or similar petition arising out of the subject matter of the present petition has ever been filed or decided between the parties in any Tribunal/court of law. The workman is a 'workman' and management of M/s Punj Security is an 'industry' as laid down in the ID Act. The workman was working at the M/s Punj Security, Chandigarh therefore, this Tribunal has got the jurisdiction to

adjudicate the present claim. There is no alternative remedy except to approach this Hon'ble Tribunal for grievances of the applicant/workman. Prayer is made that the Award may be passed in favour of the workman directing the managements to supply the provident fund account number to the workman enabling him to withdraw his provident fund.

3. On notice, the management appeared through its authorized representative and contested the claim of the workman by filing written statement on 20.12.2023, wherein it is stated that the present application (*here-in-after 'claim statement'*) has been filed by the applicant (*here-in-after 'workman'*) praying for the supply of Provident Fund Account Number to the workman enabling him to withdraw his provident fund. Not dealing with the claim statement parawise at this stage may not be construed as having admitted the truthfulness or otherwise any of the contentions thereof. All the facts stated, contentions mentioned and grounds raised except those which are specifically admitted herein are hereby denied, disputed and controverted. The answering respondent (*here-in-after 'management'*) reserves its right to file a detailed written statement to the claim statement, if any necessity arises in future or as directed by this Tribunal. The answering management is a company incorporated under the Companies Act and registered with the Ministry of Corporate Affairs, Government of India since 24.12.2013. The workman has never worked with the answering management since the incorporation of the company till date. It is an admitted position of the workman that he worked as a Helper in the company M/s Punj Security from 2006 to 2010 whereas the company M/s Punj Food Facility Management Services Limited was incorporated in the year 2013. The answering management is a separate legal entity and has nothing to do with the company M/s Punj Security. The present claim statement deserves to be dismissed on the ground of mis-joinder of parties as the claim of the workman is against the third party i.e. M/s Punj Security which has neither been made as a party before the Labour Commissioner nor in the present claim statement. It has wrongly been stated by the workman that the answering management has changed its name from M/s Punj Security to M/s Punj Food Facility Management Services. The management-company is an independent company and a newly incorporated company which is established from the Master Data record of the company as available with the Ministry of Corporate Affairs. Prayer is made that the claim statement may be dismissed qua the answering management.

4. The workman filed replication, wherein the contents of written statement are denied as wrong except the admitted facts of the claim and the averments of the statement of claim are reiterated.

5. On 03.06.2024, the workman filed an application seeking permission to withdraw the claim statement under Order XXII Rule 1 r/w Section 151 of CPC and got recorded his statement, which is reproduced as below :-

*"Stated that I have filed an application seeking permission to withdraw the present claim statement under Order XXII Rule 1 r/w Section 151 of CPC. I do not intend to proceed further with the present Industrial Disputes Reference/Statement of Claim. The statement of claim may be disposed off being not pressed."*

6. His statement was countersigned by his Representative.

7. In view of the above said statement of the workman, the present industrial dispute is disposed off being not pressed. Appropriate Government be informed. File be consigned to the record room.

(Sd.) . . . ,

Dated : 03.06.2024.

(JAGDEEP KAUR VIRK)  
PRESIDING OFFICER,  
Industrial Tribunal & Labour Court,  
Union Territory, Chandigarh.  
UID No. PB0152.

CHANDIGARH ADMINISTRATION  
LABOUR DEPARTMENT**Notification**

The 28th August, 2024

**No. 13/2/141-HII(2)-2024/13431.**—In exercise of the Powers conferred by sub-section (i) of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Central Act No. 14 of 1947) read with Government of India, Ministry of Labour & Employment's Notification No. S-11025/21/2003-IR(PL) dated 28.7.2004, the undersigned hereby publish the following award bearing reference No. **3/2020** dated **16.05.2024** delivered by the Presiding Officer, Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court, UT Chandigarh between :

PAWAN KUMAR JHA, H.NO.82, BEHLANA, U.T. CHANDIGARH. (Workman)

AND

M/S VAN NORMAN MACHINE (INDIA) PVT. LTD., PLOT NO.55, INDUSTRIAL AREA,  
PHASE - II, CHANDIGARH THROUGH ITS MANAGING DIRECTOR. (Management)**AWARD**

1. Pawan Kumar Jha, workman has presented industrial dispute under Section 2A(2) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (*here-in-after in short called 'ID Act'*).

2. Briefly stated the averments of claim statement are that the workman was appointed by the management as Machine man on 01.11.2018. The workman remained in the continuous & uninterrupted employment up to 08.08.2019 when his services were illegally & wrongfully terminated by refusing of work without assigning any reason & notice. At the time of termination the workman was drawing Rs.11,500/- per month as wages. The workman was not issued any appointment letter at the time of appointment. The workman was made member of the ESI scheme on 01.02.2019. The workman was on authorised leave due to death of his grandfather. The workman got his leave sectioned for one month but the workman reported for duty earlier. The workman worked up to 08.08.2019 but on 09.08.2019 when he went to attend his normal duty he was refused work without assigning any reason and notice. Refusal of work which amounts to termination is retrenchment under Section 2(oo) of the ID Act. The management has also violated Section 25F & 25H of the ID Act. No charge sheet was issued, no inquiry was held and the workman was not paid retrenchment compensation at the time of termination. The management has also appointed new person on his place after his termination. Violation of the same makes the termination void. The workman served upon the management a demand notice dated 09.08.2019 for his reinstatement. The management neither replied the notice nor took me back on duty. The Assistant Labour Commissioner-cum-Conciliation Officer U.T. Chandigarh was requested for his intervention. No settlement could be made possible within the stipulated time of 45 days. Action of the management in terminating his service is illegal, wrongful, motivated, against the principle of natural justice and unfair labour practice. The workman remained unemployed from the date of termination to till date. Prayer is made that the workman may be reinstated with continuity of service, with full back wages, with all attendant benefits and without any change in his service conditions within.

3. On notice, management appeared through its Representative Shri Santosh Chauhan, who filed authority letter on behalf of the management on 12.02.2021. The management contested the claim statement by filing a short written statement on the letter pad of the management-company in the form of letter addressed

to this Court, wherein the management has alleged that Mr. Pawan Jha joined them on 01.04.2019 and had been absent from 09.05.2019 to 05.06.2019 without taking leave. Again he was absent on 2nd & 3rd July, 2019 and did not turn up from 8th July, 2019. The management advised him to resume his duty with proper leave explanation but the workman did not submitted any reply and went to Labour Department.

4. Thereafter the case was adjourned to various dates. On 19.04.2021 none appeared on behalf of the management, thus notice was ordered to be issued afresh for 01.06.2021 and thereafter for 23.07.2021. Notice issued to the management for 23.07.2021 was received back executed through Smt. Santosh - Clerk despite service of notice none appeared on behalf the management vide order dated 23.07.2021 the management was proceeded against ex-parte and the case was fixed for ex-parte evidence.

5. In ex-parte evidence, the workman examined himself as AW1 and tendered his affidavit Exhibit 'AW1/A'. On 16.05.2024, Learned Representative for the workman closed ex-parte evidence.

6. I have heard the arguments of Learned Representative for the workman and perused the judicial file.

7. From the evidence led by the workman, it emerges that the workman has taken specific plea that he was appointed as Machine-man on 01.11.2018 and remained in continuous employment of the management up to 08.08.2019. On 09.08.2019 when the workman went to the management for performing his normal duties, he was verbally refused work without assigning any reason and notice. The last paid monthly salary of the workman was Rs.11,500/-. The workman has challenged verbal order dated 09.08.2019 of termination of his services by refusal of work on the ground that the management before terminating his services did not comply with the conditions laid down under Section 25F of the ID Act.

8. In the present case, the workman is proved to be in continuous service of the management w.e.f. 01.11.2018 to 08.08.2019 from which it is sufficiently proved that the workman has completed continuous period of 240 days of service in 12 calendar months preceding termination (services being terminated on 09.08.2019. Thus, the workman fulfils the requirement of Section 25B of the ID Act, which attracts Section 25F of the ID Act. In the written statement the management has taken plea that in fact the workman absented from duty on 2nd & 3rd July, 2019 and did not turn up from 08th of July, 2019. It is further pleaded in the written statement that the management advised the workman to resume his duties with proper leave explanation but he did not submit any reply and went to Labour Department. The above mentioned plea taken by the management is not acceptable as the management did not place on record any document such as any written letter or notice issued to the workman requiring him to submit explanation for his alleged leave and requiring him to resume duty. There is no evidence of the management from which it could be inferred that the workman's conduct constitutes a voluntarily abandonment of service. Under Section 25F of the ID Act no workman employed in an industrial undertaking can be retrenched by the employer until (a) the workman have been given one month's notice in writing indicating the reasons for retrenchment and the period has expired or the workman has been paid salary in lieu of such notice, (b) the workman have been paid retrenchment compensation equivalent to 15 days' average salary for every completed year of service and (c) notice in the prescribed manner is served on the appropriate Government. By Section 25F of the ID Act a prohibition against retrenchment, until the conditions prescribed by that section are fulfilled is imposed. As discussed above, in the present case, the management has neither pleaded nor proved the compliance of conditions laid down under Section 25F of the ID Act. The evidence led by the workman has gone un-rebutted and un-challenged as management despite appearance through authorised representative and filing of written statement did not further contest the present industrial dispute reference / claim statement and was proceeded against ex-parte. There is no reason to disbelieve the evidence led by the workman.



9. In view of the reasons recorded above, the management is proved to have terminated the services of the workman in violation to Section 25F of the ID Act. Consequently, the verbal order dated 09.08.2019 of termination of services of the workman is illegal and hereby set aside. Accordingly, the present industrial dispute is ex-parte allowed. The workman is held entitled to reinstatement with continuity of service and 50% back wages. The management is directed to comply with the award within three months from the date of publication of the same in Government Gazette failing which the management is liable to pay interest at the rate 8% per annum on the amount of consequential benefits from the date of this award till its realisation. Appropriate Government be informed. Copy of this award be also sent to Learned District Judge, Chandigarh in view of Sub-section 10 of Section 11 of the Industrial Disputes (Amendment) Act, 2010 for onward transmission of the same to concerned Civil Court. File be consigned to the record room.

(Sd.) . . . ,

Dated : 16.05.2024.

(JAGDEEP KAUR VIRK)  
PRESIDING OFFICER,  
Industrial Tribunal & Labour Court,  
Union Territory, Chandigarh.  
UID No. PB0152

Secretary Labour,  
Chandigarh Administration.

## HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

## Notification

The 23rd August, 2024

**No. 139 /V.A.15.**—Hon'ble the Chief Justice has been pleased to make the following appointments/promotions to the posts of Deputy Registrar on the establishment of this Hon'ble Court in Level 23 in the Pay Matrix (initial pay Rs. 83600/-) corresponding to the Pay Band of Rs.15600-39100 + Grade Pay of Rs.7600/- (unrevised as per recommendations of the 5th Punjab Pay Commission notified by the Government of Punjab in the year 2009, applicable w.e.f. 01.01.2006) with effect from **23.08.2024 :-**

S. No.	Name of the Officer (s) (Sh./Smt./Ms.)	From	To	Remarks
1	Sukhvinder Singh	Offg. Assistant Registrar	Offg. Deputy Registrar	Against a vacant post
2	Som Parkash	Offg. Assistant Registrar	Offg. Deputy Registrar	Against a vacant post
3	Sunita Sharma-II	Offg. Assistant Registrar	Offg. Deputy Registrar	Against a vacant post
4	Sanjay Kumar-II	Offg. Assistant Registrar	Offg. Deputy Registrar	Against a vacant post
5	Jagjit Singh	Offg. Assistant Registrar	Offg. Deputy Registrar	Against a vacant post
6	Sangeeta Rani	Offg. Assistant Registrar	Offg. Deputy Registrar	Against a vacant post
7	Sushma Rani	Offg. Assistant Registrar	Offg. Deputy Registrar	Against a vacant post
8	Nirmal Chauhan	Offg. Assistant Registrar	Offg. Deputy Registrar	Against a vacant post
9	Manoj Kashyap	Offg. Assistant Registrar	Offg. Deputy Registrar	Against a vacant post
10	Kamlesh Joshi	Offg. Assistant Registrar	Offg. Deputy Registrar	Against a vacant post
11	Harbans Singh	Offg. Assistant Registrar	Offg. Deputy Registrar	Against a vacant post
12	Tara Dutt Joshi	Offg. Assistant Registrar	Offg. Deputy Registrar	Against a vacant post

**Note:** The above appointments/promotions of the Officers are on probation in terms of Rule 23(1) of High Court Establishment (Appointment & Conditions of Service) Rules, 1973.

BY ORDER OF HON'BLE THE CHIEF JUSTICE.

(Sd.) . . .,

(ASHISH KUMAR BANSAL),  
Registrar (Administration),  
for Registrar General.

CHANDIGARH ADMINISTRATION  
HOME DEPARTMENT

**Notification**

The 30th August, 2024

**No. 9/9/1-IH(I)/2024/12523.**—The notification of Administrator's Advisory Council issued vide No. 9/9/1-IH(I)-2022/20412 dated 23.12.2022 has been partially modified by the Competent Authority and the revised composition of the Administrator's Advisory Council is notified as under :-

1.	Shri. Manish Tewari, Member of Parliament, Chandigarh, Guram House 20-B, Sector 4-A, Chandigarh.
2	Mr. Satnam Singh Sandhu, Member of Parliament (Rajya Sabha) and Chancellor, Chandigarh University & Founder, Chandigarh Welfare Trust, SCO-119-120 First Floor, Sector-43-B, Chandigarh
3.	Mayor, Municipal Corporation, Chandigarh.
4.	Smt. Kirron Kher, Ex Member of Parliament, Chandigarh, H.No. 65, Sector 8-A, Chandigarh
5.	Shri Satya Pal Jain, Ex MP & Additional Solicitor Attorney General, Government of India, H.No. 2224, Sector 15-C, Chandigarh
6.	Immediate Ex Mayor, Municipal Corporation, Chandigarh, Presently Sh. Anup Gupta, # 41, Sector 28A, Chandigarh
7.	President, Bhartiya Janta Party, Chandigarh, Sh. Jatinder Pal Malhotra, President BJP Chandigarh, # 242, Sector 21A, Chandigarh.
8.	President, Chandigarh Congress Committee, Chandigarh. Mr. Harmohinder Singh Lucky, # 1146, Sector 8C, Chandigarh
9.	President, Shiromani Akali Dal, Shriomani Akali Dal Office, Sector 28-B, Chandigarh.
10.	Director, PGIMER, Chandigarh.
11.	Sh. Sanjay Tandon, Ex President, BJP Chandigarh, H.No. 1636, Sector 18-D, Chandigarh.
12.	Chairperson, Chandigarh Commission for Protection of Child Rights Presently, Ms. Shipra Bansal, House No. 5797-B, Sector 38 West, Chandigarh.
13.	President, Chandigarh Transport Association, Mr. Jasbir Singh Gill, Plot No. 4 Transport Area, Sec-26 Chandigarh/ # 1348, Sector 33-C, Chandigarh
14.	President, Beopar Mandal, Mr. Charanjiv Singh SCO. 10, First Floor, Sec-21-C, Chandigarh.
15.	Chairman, Confederation of Indian Industry (CII), Northern Region, Sector-31 Chandigarh
16.	Chairman, Chandigarh Residents Associations Welfare Federation (Regd) (CRAWFED) Hitesh Kumar Puri H.No. 1214, Sector 43-B, Chandigarh
17	Chairman, Hotel & Restaurant Association Sh. Manmohan Singh Hotel Aroma Complex, Sector 22, Chandigarh

18.	Chairman, Indian Institute of Architecture, Mr. Manmohan Khanna, # 113, Sector 27-A, Chandigarh
19.	President, Chandigarh Golf Club, Sector 6, Chandigarh. Sh. Ravibeer Grewal
20.	President, Chandigarh Club, Sector 1, Chandigarh, Sandeep Sahni H.No. 118, Sector 27-A, Chandigarh
21.	President Rotary Club, Mr. Jatinder Kapoor, Rotary House, # 107-A, Sector 18-A, Chandigarh.
22.	President, FICCI, Mr GB Singh, FICCI-SCO 20-21, Sector 9-D, Chandigarh.
23.	President, Indian Medical Association, Sector-35, Chandigarh, Dr. Gurwinder Singh, # 6, Sector-11, Chandigarh
24.	Justice (Retd.) Jasbir Singh, H.No.839, Sector 16-D, Chandigarh.
25.	Lt. General K.J. Singh (Retd.), A1/33-Ground Floor, DLF Valley, Near Amaravati Enclave, Panchkula, Haryana - 134105
26.	President, Press Club, Sector 27B, Chandigarh. Mr. Saurabh Duggal, # 143-A, Sector 51-A, Chandigarh
27.	Sh. V.K. Kapoor, IPS (Retd), H.No.836, Sector 16-D, Chandigarh
28.	Sh. Vivek Atray, IAS (Retd.),H.No.18 A, Sector -10, Panchkula.
29.	Sh. Pankaj Khanna, H.No. 349 Sector 9 Chandigarh
30.	Mr. Manmohan Lal Sarin, Ex-Advocate Punjab and Haryana, H. No. 48, Sector 4, Chandigarh.
31.	Sh. Rajendra K Saboo, Chairman, KDDL Ltd. Kamla Centre, SCO 88-89, Sector 8-C, Chandigarh
32.	Prof. Rajnish Wattas, Former Principal, Chandigarh College of Architecture, H.No. 72, Sector 28-A Chandigarh
33.	Mrs. Jyotsna Wig (Nominated Councillor, MC) E-11, Uppal Marble Arch, Manimajra Chandigarh.
34.	Sh. Vineet Joshi, H.No. 3276 Sector 15-D, Chandigarh
35.	Radheshyam Garg, H.No. 1679, Sector 33-D, Chandigarh
36.	Shri Yudhvir Singh Kaura, Plot No. 73 Industrial Area Ph-2 Chandigarh
37.	Leader of the largest Opposition Party in Municipal Corporation Presently Mr. Kanwarjit Rana #249/2, Sector 45A, Chandigarh
38.	Vice Chancellor, Panjab University, Chandigarh.
39.	Chairperson, Child Welfare Committee, Dr. Gurpreet Kaur, # 1642, Sector 39-B, Chandigarh
40.	President of PhD Chamber of Commerce & Industries, Sector 31/A, Chandigarh. Mr. M.S. Vig, # 224, Sector 9C, Chandigarh
41.	Immediate Ex Chief Secretary, Punjab presently Sh. Vijay Kumar Janjua, IAS (Retd.), House No 2068, Phase 7, Mohali, Punjab



42	Immediate Ex Chief Secretary, Haryana by designation presently Sh. Sanjeev Kaushal, IAS Retd., H.No.39, Sector -4, Chandigarh
43	Representative, SGPC Mr. Lakhvir Singh, H.No. 30 Sector - 5 Chandigarh
44	Sh. S.D. Sharma, Architect (Retd.) H.No. 191 Sector 7 Panchkula
45	Furqan Khan, Director, NZCC, Patiala, Punjab.
46	President, Federation of Sector Welfare Associations, UT, Chandigarh, Sh. Baljinder Singh, H.No.3102, Sector-21-D, Chandigarh.
47	President, Lions Club, Sector 18-D, Chandigarh. Sh. Harminder Singh Atwal, # 630, Sector 11-B, Chandigarh
48	Maj General (Retd.) M.S. Kandal, H.No.238, Sector 35-A, Chandigarh
49	Dr. Raj Bahadur, Director, Regional Spinal Injury Centre, Sector-70 Mohali.
50	President, Chandigarh Traders Association, Mr. Kamaljit Singh Panchi, # 9 First Floor, Sector 18-A, Chandigarh
51	President, Chandigarh Industrial Association, Mr. MPS Chawla Plot No. 25 & 26/9, Industrial Area, Ph-2, Chandigarh.
52	Mr. Rakesh Rattan Aggarwal, Sr. Vice-President, Laghu Udyog Bharti, Chandigarh, Plot No. 703, Industrial Area, Phase-I, Chandigarh.
53	Mr. S.K. Gupta, Former Professor of Sociology & Hony. Director Sports, Panjab University, Chandigarh, H.No. 404, Sector 37A Chandigarh
54	Ms. Anamika Walia, H.No. 2082, Sec-48A, Guru Nanak Vihar, Near Motor Market, Chandigarh
55	Mr. Daves Moudgil, H.No. 390, Sector 44-A, Chandigarh
56	Mr. Avi Bhasin, Chairman, Industrial Shed Welfare Association H.No. 438-A, Industrial Area, Phase-II, Chandigarh
57	Mr. Arun Sood, H.No. 1185, Sec 37-B, Chandigarh
58	Mr. Gladwin John Hardy, H.No. 315/2, Sec 45A, Chandigarh
59	Col Irshad Khan (Retd.), H.No. 318, Sector 114, Ansal API, Golf Link-I Mohali, Punjab
60.	President, Aam Aadmi Party, Chandigarh

2. No TA/DA will be paid to the members for attending the meetings of the Council.
3. The term of this Council shall be for a period of two years from 01.01.2023 to 31.12.2024.

Chandigarh :  
The 29th August, 2024.

HARI KALLIKKAT, IAS,  
Secretary Coordination,  
Chandigarh Administration.

CHANDIGARH ADMINISTRATION  
HOME DEPARTMENT**Order**

The 30th August, 2024

**No. 9/9/1-IH(I)/2024/12532.**—In partial modification of orders No. 9/9/1-IH(I)2022/20429 dated 23.12.2022, the Administrator, Union Territory of Chandigarh is pleased to make the following changes in Standing Committee of the Adviser Council as mentioned below :-

- i) Shri. Manish Tewari, Member of Parliament is included as a Chairman of Standing Committee of Administrator Advisory Council on Transportation in place of Ms. Kirron Kher, Ex-Member of Parliament, Chandigarh.
- ii) Prof. Renu Vig, Vice Chancellor, Panjab University, Chandigarh is included as a member of Standing Committee of Administrator's Adviser Council on Education in place of Prof. Raj Kumar, Ex-Vice Chancellor, Panjab University, Chandigarh.

Chandigarh :  
The 29th August, 2024

HARI KALLIKKAT, IAS,  
Secretary Coordination,  
Chandigarh Administration

*"No legal responsibility is accepted for the contents of publication of advertisements/public notices in this part of the Chandigarh Administration Gazette. Persons notifying the advertisements/public notices will remain solely responsible for the legal consequences and also for any other misrepresentation etc."*